



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 1, 2005

Mr. Steve Aragón  
Chief Counsel  
Texas Health and Human Services Commission  
P. O. Box 13247  
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2005-04765

Dear Mr. Aragón:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 225156.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for a particular investigation. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the common law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation into allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the accused individual responding to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

When there is an adequate summary of the investigation, the summary must be released along with the statement of the accused, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements.

The submitted records contain information that we find to be analogous to the summary released in *Ellen*, as well as the accused's statement. In accordance with the holding in *Ellen*, the commission must release the summary and statement, which we have marked. However, in accordance with the common law privacy principles discussed in *Ellen*, the commission must redact the information that we have indicated tends to identify a witness before releasing these documents. Ordinarily, the commission would also be required to withhold from these documents information that would identify the complainant. However, in this instance the requestor is the complainant and therefore has a special right of access to the information that identifies her. See Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). The remaining submitted information, including individual complainant and witness statements as well as other supporting documentary evidence, must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in accordance with the common law privacy concerns expressed in *Ellen*.<sup>1</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the

---

<sup>1</sup>Because the records being released contain information relating to the requestor that would be excepted from disclosure to the general public to protect her privacy, the department must request another ruling from our office if it receives a future request for this information from an individual other than this requestor or her authorized representative.

statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Vela III', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

José Vela III  
Drafting Attorney  
Open Records Division

JV/krl

Ref: ID# 225156

Enc. Submitted documents